

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/765,057	01/28/2004	Osamu Kobayashi	118500	9456
25944 7.	590 03/09/2005		EXAM	NER
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			KOSLOW, CAROL M	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1755	<del></del>

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/765,057	KOBAYASHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	C. Melissa Koslow	1755			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replication of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a ply within the statutory minimum of this will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Thi	—· is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 3-7 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/s</li> </ul>	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	·	• • •			
		d Omoc Action of Tomic 102.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Into have been received in a control of the latest t	Application No  I received in this National Stage			
144 h					
Attachment(s)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No.	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Application/Control Number: 10/765,057

Art Unit: 1755

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 2 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/766,923. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the ferrite composition claimed in the copending application overlaps that claimed in this applicant. It is clear from reading the specification that the claimed amount of Mn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and FeO can be zero. Thus the fact that the ferrite in the copending application does not claim an amount of Mn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and FeO does not exclude it as a basis for a rejection. In addition, the examples in the copending application show that the claimed ferrite inherently

Art Unit: 1755

contains 0.1 mol% Mn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and 0.1 mol% FeO. Therefore the claims composition suggests the claimed ferrite of this application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 3-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of a ferrite having the claimed composition. JP 07-230909 is cited as of interest, but the taught amount of Mn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> of 1.4-5 mol% is outside the claimed range and there is no suggestion to decrease the amount of Mn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> so it overlaps the claimed range.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa Koslow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1371. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo, can be reached at (571) 272-1233.

The fax number for all official communications is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmk March 4, 2005 C. Melissa Koslow Primary Examiner Tech. Center 1700